

A SYNODICON OF ANTIOCH AND LACEDAEMONIA

ROMILLY J. H. JENKINS and CYRIL MANGO

THIS codex,* which served as the Synodicon¹ first of Antioch in the eleventh century, and then of Lacedaemonia in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, is interesting for more reasons than one. The dedication proves it to have been among the books of Nicephorus Moschopoulos, metropolitan of Crete and "proedros" of Lacedaemonia (*infra*, p. 241), and to have been presented by him to his church of St. Demetrios at Mistra some time after 1292. How or where he acquired it cannot be said; nor how it came to be removed from the church to which he presented it. As it turned up at Berlin in 1718, it is possible that it was removed by one of Prince Maximilian's Brandenburgers during the Venetian campaigns of 1684-6 in the Morea.

In the following sections we give a summary account of the contents of the document, and, in addition, some comments on its significance, composition, chronology, and historical interest. It is certain that scholars will find in it much more that is of importance than we have space to record here. We hope

* (Dr. Egon Wellesz was the first to recognize the importance of the MS Holkham gr. 6, and he drew my attention to it in 1957. He also very kindly presented a microfilm of it to Dumbarton Oaks. The original plan was that Dr. Wellesz and I should write a joint study of it, in which he would discuss the ecphonic notation contained in the MS, whereas I would be concerned with the historical and philological problems. Later, however, when Dr. Wellesz found that other commitments would for a time prevent his writing his part of the study, we agreed that I should publish my part separately. I asked Professor Jenkins to collaborate with me in this, and he has done so. Both he and I look forward to the early completion and publication of Dr. Wellesz's study. We should also like to thank Mr. John Parker of St. Antony's College, Oxford, for checking the constitution of the MS; and Miss Ruth Barbour, of the Bodleian Library, for permission to publish our plates. C.M.)

¹ For the term Synodicon, see H.-G. Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), 155 and note 2; Grumel, *Les regestes*, no. 425.

that this introduction will be of service to them.

1. Description of the Manuscript

MS Holkham gr. 6 (172) was acquired by Thomas Coke, first Earl of Leicester, in 1718 from the library of A. E. Seidel at Berlin.² It is written, with the exception of a few pages, on vellum and consists of iv+173 fols. measuring 220×160 mm. The leaves have been trimmed in binding with the result that several marginal scholia and quire-marks have been amputated. The MS, as we shall see, is not homogeneous: fols. 1, 6-121, 128-159 and 170 are original and were written at Antioch shortly after 1050; fols. 2-5 and 160-169, also of parchment, represent a later repair of the MS; fols. 122-127, of paper, originally belonged to a different MS, probably of the fifteenth century.

The original part of the MS is written in a large, clear hand with only twelve lines per page. The text, obviously meant for recital in church, is accompanied by ecphonic notation. Several pages (fols. 17^v, 18^r, 65^v, 129^{r-v}) have been left partly or entirely blank, presumably for the insertion of further names of bishops and emperors who might, in the course of time, have been added to the list of commemorations. The inserted folios have no musical notation. The contents of the MS are at present as follows:

Fol. iv^v (fig. 1), *ex-libris* of Nicephorus Moschopoulos written in an archaizing hand: Τὸ παρὸν συνοδικὸν βιβλίον ἀφιερῶθῃ καὶ ἀνετέθῃ παρ' ἐμοῦ τοῦ ταπεινοῦ χρηματίσαντος μητροπολίτου Κρήτης Νικηφόρου τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ μητροπόλει

² See Seymour de Ricci, *A Handlist of Manuscripts in the Library of the Earl of Leicester at Holkham Hall*, Suppl. to the Bibliographical Society's Trans., No. 7 (Oxford, 1932), p. 15. The MS is here incorrectly ascribed to the twelfth century. More accurate description by Ruth Barbour, "Summary Description of the Greek Manuscripts from the Library at Holkham Hall," *Bodleian Library Record*, VI, 5 (1960), p. 593.

Λακεδαιμονίας ἐν τῷ παρ' ἐμοῦ δομηθέντι ναῶ τοῦ ἁγίου ἐνδόξου μεγαλομάρτυρος καὶ θαυματουργοῦ Δημητρίου· εἴ τις δὲ βουληθῇ ἀποσπᾶσαι αὐτὸ τῆς τοιαύτης ἁγιωτάτης τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας ἢ τὰ παρόντα ἀπαλεῖψαι καὶ ἀφανίσει γράμματα ἵνα ἐπισπᾶται [sic] τὰς ἀρὰς τῶν ἁγίων καὶ θεοφόρων πατέρων τῶν ἐν Νικαίᾳ καὶ ἐμοῦ τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ. ὀφείλουσι δὲ οἱ κληρικοὶ τῆς τοιαύτης ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας μνημονεῦν ἐν τῷ ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τῇ κυριακῇ τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας τῆς ἡμῶν ταπεινότητος.

Fol. 1^r, *Horos of the Union of 920, tit.* "Ἐκθεσις ἥτοι ἀνάμνησις τῆς γενομένης τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐνώσεως, etc., *inc.* 'Ο κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ Θεός = Mansi, XVIII, cols. 336–341; Rhallès and Potlès, *Σύνταγμα*, V, pp. 4–10; Zachariä von Lingenthal, *Jus graeco-romanum*, III, pp. 228–233; J. Zepos and P. Zepos, *Jus graecoromanum*, I, pp. 193–196.

Fol. 1^r has a Γ -shaped ornament in red containing a title in capital letters that is almost obliterated. No date of commemoration is given. Fols. 2–5 are, as we have said, a later addition supplying what must have been a gap in the original ms.; the handwriting imitates the earlier one. These leaves were probably written at the time of Nicephorus Moschopoulos.

After the end of the *horos* (*des.* μέχρι τῆς συμπληρώσεως τοῦ ἐβδόμου ἔτους) there follow these commemorations: (fol. 16^v) Πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῶν βασιλέων. Κωνσταντίνου καὶ Θεοδώρου τῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἡμῶν βασιλέων πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη. Βασιλείου καὶ Κωνσταντίνου, Λέοντος καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου, Χριστοφόρου καὶ Ῥωμανοῦ, Κωνσταντίνου, Ῥωμανοῦ, [fol. 17^r] Νικηφόρου καὶ Ἰωάννου, Βασιλείου, Κωνσταντίνου, Ῥωμανοῦ καὶ Μιχαὴλ τῶν τὴν οὐράνιον βασιλείαν τῆς ἐπιγείου ἀλλαξαμένων αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη.

Εὐδοκίας καὶ Θεοφανοῦς, Θεοδώρου, Ἐλένης, Θεοφανοῦς καὶ Ζωῆς τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων αὐγουστῶν αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη.

[fol. 17^v (fig. 2)] Σωφρονίου τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου ἡμῶν πατριάρχου πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη. Most of fol. 17^v and fol. 18^r are blank.

[fol. 18^v] Χριστοφόρου, Θεοδώρου, Ἀγαπίου καὶ Ἰωάννου, Νικολάου, Ἡλιοῦ, Θεοδώρου καὶ Βασιλείου τῶν ἁγιωτάτων πατριαρχῶν Ἀντιοχείας αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη.

Γερμανοῦ, Ταρασίου, Νικηφόρου καὶ Μεθοδίου τῶν ἀοιδίμων καὶ μακαρίων πατριαρχῶν αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη.

[fol. 19^r] Ἰγνατίου, Φωτίου, Στεφάνου καὶ Ἀντωνίου, Νικολάου καὶ Εὐθυμίου, Στεφάνου, Τρύφωνος

καὶ Θεοφυλάκτου, Πολυεύκτου καὶ Ἀντωνίου, Νικολάου, Σισινίου, Σεργίου, Εὐσταθίου καὶ Ἀλεξίου τῶν ὀρθοδόξων πατριαρχῶν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη.

[fol. 19^v] Ἡ ἁγία Τριάς αὐτοὺς ἐδόξασεν.

This is followed by the usual anathema upon anything that has been said or written against the Patriarchs Germanus, Tarasius, Nicephorus, Methodius, Ignatius, Photius, Stephen, Antony, and Nicholas, and the concluding canons, from Ἀπαντα τὰ παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν, etc. = e.g., Rhallès and Potlès, *op. cit.*, V, pp. 9–10. The text breaks off almost at its very end on fol. 22^v with πρεσβείαις τῆς δεσποῖ || <νῆς ἡμῶν, etc.>

Fol. 23^r (fig. 3), *Horos of the Council of Chalcedon*. At the top of the page are given the following directions: ἀναγινώσκει(αι) ἡ σύνοδος(ς) αὐτ(η) κ(υριακῇ) τῶν ἀλλακ(τῶν): μηνὶ Ἰουλ(ίῳ) 15' ἐὰν τύχ(οι) ἐν κ(υριακῇ) ἀναγινώ(σκειται) ἡ σύνοδος(ς) αὐτ(η). εἰ δὲ ἐν β' ἢ τρίτ(η) ἢ δ' ἀναγινώ(σκειται) τῇ ὀπισθ(εν) κυ(ριακῇ), εἰ (δὲ) ἐν ε' ἢ ζ' ἀναγινώ(σκειται) τῇ ἔμπρ(οσθεν) κ(υριακῇ). *Tit.* Ὁρος τῆς ἁγίας καὶ οἰκουμένης ἐν Χαλκηδόνι συνόδου. *Inc.* Ἡ ἁγία μεγάλη καὶ οἰκουμένη σύνοδος, etc. This contains the definition of the Fifth Session with the symbols of Nicaea and Constantinople (*inc.* Ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρ, *des.* ἀναθεματί-ζεσθαι αὐτοὺς = Mansi, VII, cols. 108C–117A), followed by the conclusion of the Sixth Session (*inc.* Ὁ θεϊότατος καὶ εὐσεβεστάτος βασιλεὺς = Mansi, VII, fol. 169B ff.). On fol. 45^r are inserted acclamations of the reigning imperial couple, Constantine IX and Theodora, and on fol. 45^v of Sophronius, "our most-holy Patriarch." The text of Chalcedon then resumes with Ὁ θεϊότατος καὶ εὐσεβεστάτος ἡμῶν δεσπότης πρὸς τὴν ἁγίαν σύνοδον εἶπεν, down to παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ δωρηθήσεσθαι = Mansi, VII, col. 172B.

Fol. 47^r, *Horos of the Council of 536*. In the upper margin: ἀναγινώσκει(αι) ἡ σύνοδος(ς) αὐτ(η) κ(υριακῇ) τ(ῶν) ἀλλακ(τῶν). Below ornamental band: τῇ [sic] δὲ ἐχομέ(νῃ) ἄλλῃ κ(υριακῇ) ἀναγινώ(σκειται) ἡ αὐτ(η) σύνοδος(ς). *Tit.* Ὁρος τῆς ἁγίας καὶ μεγάλης συνόδου τῆς κατὰ τὴν βασιλίδαν συνελθούσης πόλιν κατὰ τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς Σευήρου καὶ τῶν τὰ ὅμοια αὐτῷ φρονησάντων αἵρετικῶν. Excerpts from the Fifth Session, including the allocution of the Patriarch Menas. *Inc.* Ὁ ἁγιώτατος καὶ μακαριώτατος πατριάρχης [fol. 47^v] Μηνᾶς εἶπεν· ἡ συμπαροῦσα ἡμῖν ἁγία σύνοδος = Mansi, VIII, col. 1135D,

down to the end of Menas' speech (*ibid.*, col. 1142D). This is followed by anathemas against Severus and his followers, against the Nestorians and the Jacobites; acclamations of Constantine IX and Theodora (fol. 64^v) and of the Patriarch Sophronius (fol. 65^r). Fol. 65^v is blank.

Fol. 66^r, *Horos of the Sixth Oecumenical Council*. In the upper margin: ἀναγινώσκει(αι) ἡ σύνοδος(ος) αὕτη κ(υριακῇ) μετὰ τὴν ὑψω(σιν). *Tit.* "Ὁρος τῆς ἁγίας καὶ οἰκουμενικῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ἑκτῆς συνόδου. *Inc.* 'Ἡ ἁγία καὶ μεγάλη καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ σύνοδος ἡ κατὰ Θεοῦ χάριν, etc. = Mansi, XI, col. 632Bff., down to ἀναθεματίζεσθαι αὐτούς = *ibid.*, col. 640C. The text continues with Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ εὐσεβέστατος βασιλεὺς εἶπεν = *ibid.*, col. 656A. Note that after ὅλοις τοῖς αἱρετικοῖς ἀνάθεμα = *ibid.*, col. 656C, our MS adds (fol. 93^r) "Ὅλοις τοῖς Νεστοριανοῖς ἀνάθεμα γ'. "Ὅλοις τοῖς Ἰακωβίταις [sic] ἀνάθεμα γ'. Then the text resumes with τοῖς κηρύττει καὶ κηρύττουσι, etc. This is followed by acclamations of Constantine IX and Theodora (fol. 93^v) and of the Patriarch Sophronius (fol. 94^r). The conciliar text continues with Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ εὐσεβέστατος βασιλεὺς εἶπεν· εἰ καὶ πάντως, etc. = Mansi, XI, col. 657C, down to καὶ ὑμῶν εὐχαῖς λήψεσθαι (Mansi, XI, col. 657D has instead τῆς ὑμῶν ἀγιότητος δέξασθαι).

Fol. 96^r, *Horos of the Seventh Oecumenical Council*. At the top of the page: ἀναγινώσκει(αι) ἡ σύνοδος(ος) αὕτη(η) μηνὶ ὀκτωβρίῳ 1α': τῇ 1α' τοῦ ὀκτωβρίου μην(ος) ἐὰν τύχ(οι) ἐν κ(υριακῇ) ἀναγινώσκειται ἡ σύνοδος(ος). εἰ δὲ ἐν β' ἢ γ' ἢ δ' ἀναγινώσκειται τῇ ὀπισθεν(εν) κ(υριακῇ)· εἰ δὲ ἐν ε' ἢ ζ' ἢ σα(ββάτῳ) ἀναγινώσκειται τῇ ἔμπροσθεν. *Tit.* "Ὁρος τῆς ἁγίας μεγάλης καὶ οἰκουμενικῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνόδου τὸ δεύτερον. *Inc.* 'Ἡ ἁγία μεγάλη καὶ οἰκουμενικὴ σύνοδος, etc. = Mansi, XIII, col. 373Dff. After προσκυνεῖ ἐν αὐτῇ τοῦ ἐγγραφομένου τὴν ὑπόστασιν (*ibid.*, col. 377E), our MS continues: (fol. 109^v) δῆλον δὲ τοῦτο καὶ [fol. 110^r] τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν πεφανερωμένον καὶ ἐγνωσμένον καὶ κεκηρυγμένον ὡς ἐξ εἰκόνων καὶ ἐν εἰκόσι τιμᾶται καὶ προσκυνεῖται ἡ ἀλήθεια, ὡς ἐν τῇ ἑκτῇ ἁγίᾳ οἰκουμενικῇ συνόδῳ ἐμφέρεται ἐπὶ λέξεως οὕτως ἐχούσης· ἐν τισὶ τῶν σεπτῶν εἰκόνων, etc. quoting the famous eighty-second canon of the Quinisext Council (Mansi, XI, cols. 977–980). The text then resumes with οὕτω γὰρ κρατύνεται, etc. = Mansi, XIII, col. 377E^{ff.}, down to τῆς

κοινωνίας ἀφορίζεσθαι (*ibid.*, col. 380B). This is followed by 'Ἡ ἁγία σύνοδος ἐξεβόησεν, etc. = *ibid.*, col. 397Cf. After the acclamation of Constantine VI and Irene, our MS inserts a commemoration of the Patriarch Germanus and anathemas against the Nestorians and the Jacobites (fol. 118^{r-v}). The text resumes with τῷ φρουραζμένῳ συνεδρίῳ = Mansi, XIII, col. 400A, and continues with minor variations down to ἐγγραφόν τε ἢ ἀγραφον ἀθετεῖ, ἀνάθεμα = *ibid.*, col. 400C. Next come the acclamations of Constantine IX and Theodora (fol. 121^v [fig. 4]). The text continues, without interruption, on fol. 128^r with the commemoration of the Patriarch Sophronius, of the dead emperors from Basil I to Michael IV and of the dead empresses from Eudocia to Zoe. Most of fol. 129^r and all of 129^v are blank. The commemorations continue on fol. 130^r with the dead patriarchs of Antioch from Christopher to Basil, of the patriarchs of Constantinople from Germanus to Alexius, and of Theodore the Studite. The conclusion, ὦν ταῖς διαλογαῖς, etc. = Mansi, XIII, col. 400D. On fol. 131^v a later hand has written twice, Γρηγορίου τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου μητροπολίτου Λακεδαιμονίας αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη.³

Fols. 122–127 have been torn, as we have said, out of a different MS. On fol. 122^r is the end of what appears to be a homily on the feast of a martyr. Fols. 122^v (fig. 5)–127^r contain the condemnation of Barlaam and Acindynus (= F. Uspenskij, *Sinodik v nedelju Pravoslavija* [Odessa, 1893], p. 30ff.) divided into sixteen headings. Our text differs in the following respects from that published by Uspenskij:

1. Uspenskij's § 9, p. 34 (*inc.* 'Ἀνδρονίκου τοῦ αἰοιδίου καὶ μακαρίου βασιλέως) follows immediately after §§ 6–7 which in our MS are combined as § 6.

2. The next paragraph (no. 8 in the MS) is Uspenskij's no. 11, *inc.* Πάντων τῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς ὀρθοδοξίας συναγωνισαμένων τῷ αἰοιδίῳ καὶ μακαρίτῃ (μακαρίῳ Usp.) τούτῳ βασιλεῖ. This is obviously the correct sequence, since the previous paragraph is concerned with the Emperor Andronicus III.⁴

³ On this Gregory, see *infra*, p. 242.

⁴ This has already been pointed out by J. Meyendorff, *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas* (Paris, 1959), p. 153, note 126.

3. The next paragraph in the MS (no. 9 on fol. 125^r) is not given by Uspenskij. It is devoted to the Empress Anne of Savoy who assumed the veil under the name of Anastasia.⁵

4. After Uspenskij's § 15, p. 38, the final one in his edition (= no. 14 in the MS), our text adds two more: (fol. 126^v) ιε'. Δωροθέου⁶ τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης τοῦ δῶρον ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐκ Θεοῦ δοθέντος τῷ τῶν χριστιανῶν πληρώματι, καὶ ταῖς θεοειδέσι μὲν ἀρεταῖς περιβοήτου τοῖς πᾶσι καὶ θαυμαστοῦ γεγενημένου καὶ ταῖς πατρικαῖς καὶ πνευματικαῖς εἰσηγήσεσι καὶ διδασκαλαῖς, καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης καὶ μετὰ τὸ [fol. 127^r] δέξασθαι ταύτην, πάντας καταφωτίσαντος, ἰδρώτας δὲ καὶ πόνους καὶ φυλακὰς καὶ πολλὰς κακώσεις ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐσεβείας καὶ τῶν ὁρθῶν δογμάτων τῆς Χριστοῦ ἐκκλησίας ὑπομεμενηκότος σὺν ἅμα τῷ θεῷ καὶ θαυμαστῷ πατρὶ καὶ διδασκάλῳ Γρηγορίῳ τῷ πάνν, αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη. γ'.

ις'. Φιλοθέου⁷ τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου καὶ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου, τοῦ μυρίοις ἀγῶσι καὶ κόποις καὶ θείῳ ζήλῳ τὴν ὁρθόδοξον πίστιν κρατύναντος καὶ καθελόντος ἄριστα τοὺς ἐφευρετὰς τῶν αἰρέσεων τῇ εὐσεβεῖ ὁμολογίᾳ, ἐν τῇ ἱερᾷ προεξάρχοντος συνόδῳ, καὶ λόγοις καὶ πράγμασιν, αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη. γ'.

In the lower margin of fol. 125^r a hand, not much later than that of the scribe, has written:

Ἰωάννου⁸ τοῦ ὁρθοδοξοτάτου, ἀοιδήμου [sic] καὶ μακαρίτου βασιλέως ἡμῶν τοῦ Παλαιολόγου αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη. γ'.

Ἰωάννου⁹ τοῦ ὁρθοδοξοτάτου, ἀοιδήμου [sic] καὶ μακαρίτου βασιλέως ἡμῶν τοῦ Καντακουζηνοῦ, τοῦ διὰ τοῦ θείου καὶ ἀγγελικοῦ σχήματος μετονομασθέντος Ἰωάσαφ μοναχοῦ, τοῦ γενναίως καὶ ὅλη ψυχῇ ἀνδρισμένου ὑπὲρ τῶν ὁρθῶν τῆς εὐσεβείας δογμάτων, καὶ κατὰ τῆς αἰρέσεως τῆς πονηρᾶς καὶ

⁵ Similar text in *Triodion*, ed. M. Saliberos (Athens, n. d.), p. 154. Anne is thought to have died in 1359 and is stated, on rather dubious authority, to have entered the Third Franciscan Order. See D. Muratore, "Una principessa sabauda sul trono di Bisanzio," *Mém. de l'Acad. des Sciences, Belles-Lettres et Arts de Savoie*, 4^e sér., XI (1909), p. 462 ff.

⁶ According to L. Petit, Dorotheus was bishop of Thessalonica between 1371 and 1379: "Les évêques de Thessalonique," *Echos d'Orient*, V (1901/2), p. 94. He was a devoted disciple of Gregory Palamas with whom he was imprisoned in 1343. See Meyendorff, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

⁷ The Patriarch Philotheus Kokkinos (1353-1354, 1364-1376). Similar commemoration in *Triodion*, *loc. cit.*

⁸ John V Palaeologus, d. 1391.

⁹ John VI Cantacuzenus, d. 1383.

ἀθείου. . . . The last line has been cut off. In the middle of fol. 127^r is written: Ἰσιδώρου¹⁰ τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου μητροπολίτου Θεσσαλονίκης αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη. . . . [name erased] αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη. Fol. 127^v is blank.

Fol. 132^r, *Horos of the Feast of Orthodoxy*. Below ornamental band: ἀναγινώσκει(αι) ἡ σύνοδος αὐτ(η) κ(υριακῇ) τῆς ὁρθ(ο)δοξίας. *Tit.* Ἐποφειλομένη πρὸς Θεὸν ἐτήσιος εὐχαριστία, etc. = Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca Coisliniana* (Paris, 1715), pp. 96-102; Uspenskij, *Sinodik*, p. 1 ff. The text offers some slight variants which should be taken into account in a critical edition of the Synodicon. It is worthy of notice that the commemoration of Ignatius, Photius, and later patriarchs (Uspenskij, pp. 9-10), which is found in all other known MSS, is missing from our text and has been added by a later hand in the margin of fol. 149^v (Ἰγνατίου, Φωτίου, Στεφάνου, Ἀντωνίου καὶ Νικολάου τῶν ἀγιωτάτων καὶ ὁρθοδόξων πατριαρχῶν αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη). The next paragraph (Uspenskij, p. 10), pronouncing anathema on everything that has been written or said against Germanus, Tarasius, Nicephorus, and Methodius, likewise omits the names of Ignatius, Photius, Stephen, Anthony, and Nicholas. We may suppose, therefore, that we have here the original version of the Synodicon.

In the lower margin of fol. 148^v a later hand has added a commemoration of SS. John Chrysostom, Gregory the Theologian, and Basil the Great. Before the commemoration of Euthymius, Theophilus, and Aemilianus (Uspenskij, p. 10), a later hand has added (fol. 150^r): Στεφάνου τοῦ ὁσιομάρτυρος καὶ ὁμολογητοῦ τοῦ νέου αἰωνία <ἡ μνήμη>. On fol. 151^v, after the commemoration of Hilarion and Symeon (Uspenskij, pp. 10-11 has these in the reverse order), a later hand has added: Θεοφάνους τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου ἡγουμένου τοῦ Μεγάλου Ἀγροῦ αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη. γ'. (So also Uspenskij, p. 11). Νίκωνος [τοῦ μετανοεῖτε in the margin] καὶ Ἰωαννικίου τῶν ἀγιωτάτων καὶ θαυματουργῶν αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη. γ'. The text continues down to and including the paragraph condemning Paul, Theodore Gastes, etc. (Uspenskij, p. 14). This is immediately followed on fol. 159^v

¹⁰ Isidore Glabas, metropolitan of Thessalonica (1380-1396). See R.-J. Loenertz, "Isidore Glabas, métropolitte de Thessalonique," *Rev. des études byzantines*, VI (1948), pp. 181-187.

by the conclusion (Uspenskij, p. 39f.): "Ολοι τοῖς αἵρετικοῖς ἀνάθεμα. "Ολοι τοῖς Νεστοριανοῖς ἀνάθεμα. "Ολοι τοῖς Ἰακωβίταις ἀνάθεμα (the two latter entries, which are not in Uspenskij, have been crossed out by a later hand). Τῷ φρυαξαμένῳ συνεδρίῳ κατὰ τῶν σεπτῶν εἰκόνων ἀνάθεμα. In the lower margin of this page a later hand has written: Τῷ δεχομένῳ τὰ δυσσεβῆ τῆς αἵρέσεως αὐτῶν λογίδρια ἀνάθεμα. γ' (= Mansi, XIII, col. 400A). The original MS breaks off at this point. Fol. 160 is written in the same large hand as fols. 2–5 and continues the text from τοῖς ἐκλαμβάνουσι down to ἐνυβρίζουσι πίστιν, ἀνάθεμα (Uspenskij, p. 39). In the lower margin of fol. 160^r a different hand has added: Τοῖς μὴ ἀσπαζομένοις τὰς ἀγίας καὶ σεπτὰς εἰκόνας ἀνάθεμα. In the left and lower margin of fol. 160^v a later hand has written these anathemas from the Acts of the Seventh Council (Mansi XIII, col. 400 A–B): (Θε)οδοσίῳ τῷ ψευδονύμῳ ἐπι(σκόπ)ῳ Ἐφέσου, ἀνάθεμα α'. (Σισιν)νίῳ τῷ ἐπίκλην Παστιλᾶ (ἀν)άθ(εμα) α'. (Βα)σιλείῳ τῷ κακεμφάτῳ (Τρικ)-ακάβῳ ἀνάθεμα α'. (Ἀν)αστασίῳ, Κωνσταντίνῳ καὶ Νικήτῃ τοῖς κατὰ διαδοχὴν τοῦ θρόνου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως προεδρεύσασιν, ὡς νέφ' Ἀρείῳ, (Νε)στορίῳ καὶ Διοσκόρῳ ἀνάθεμα γ'. Ἡ ἀγία Τριάς τῶν τριῶν τὸ δόγμα καθεῖλεν.

Fols. 161–167 are uniformly written in a smaller fourteenth-century hand. Fols. 161^r (fig. 6)–162^r continue the text of the Synodicon from Γερωντίῳ τῷ ἐκ Λάμπης (Uspenskij, p. 14) down to ἡ ἀγνότης πλημμελησάντων, ἀνάθεμα (*ibid.*, p. 16). In the upper margin of fol. 161^r appears: Ἰωάννη Νικομηδείας καὶ Κωνσταντίνῳ Νεκολείας τοῖς αἵρεσιάρχαις, ἀνάθεμα. Προσέτι τοῖς ζηλώσασιν καὶ μιμησαμένοις τὴν τριφυᾶ κακίαν τῶν εἰρημένων αἵρεσιάρχων προέδρων, ἀνάθεμα γ'. Εἴ τις Χριστὸν τὸν Θεὸν περιγραπτὸν οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, ἀνάθεμα γ'. In the right margin: Εἴ τις πᾶσαν παράδοσιν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἔγγραφ(ον) ἢ ἄγραφον ἀθ(ετεί), ἀνάθεμα (cf. Mansi XIII, col. 400 C; Uspenskij, p. 39); and lower down in the same margin, an illegible note apparently prescribing the number of anathemas.

At fol. 162^r the main text continues with the two anathemas against Eustratius and Leo of Chalcedon (cf. Uspenskij, p. 21): Τοῖς λέγουσιν ἡ φρονούσι προσκυνεῖν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ... καὶ λατρεύοντα δουλικῶς, ἀνάθεμα: and thence until fol. 164^v it proceeds in order with the anathemas of Uspenskij, pp. 22–24: Τὰ εἰσα-

χθέντα καὶ λαληθέντα ... ἐφευρεταῖς, ἀνάθεμα. And then, still on fol. 164^v: Τοῖς μὴ πίστει καθαρᾷ ... γνώμην συνιστᾶν, ἀνάθεμα. (Uspenskij, p. 16).

Fol. 165 is devoted to commemorations of emperors, augustas, and patriarchs, as follows: 165^r, Βασιλείῳ, Κωνσταντίνῳ, Λέοντος καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου, Χριστοφόρου καὶ Ῥωμανοῦ, Κωνσταντίνου, Ῥωμανοῦ, Νικήφору καὶ Ἰωάννου, Βασιλείῳ, Κωνσταντίνῳ, Ῥωμανοῦ καὶ Μιχαήλ, Κωνσταντίνῳ, Μιχαήλ, Ἰσαακίου, Κωνσταντίνῳ, Ῥωμανοῦ, Ἀνδρονίκου, Μιχαήλ, Νικήφору καὶ Ἰσαακίου, Ἀλεξίου, Θεοδώρου, Ἰωάννου καὶ Θεοδώρου μοναχοῦ τῶν τὴν οὐράνιον βασιλείαν τῆς ἐπιγείου ἀλλαξαμένων, αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ'.

Εὐδοκίας καὶ Θεοφανοῦς, Θεοδώρας, Ἐλένης, Θεοφανοῦς καὶ Ζωῆς, Θεοδώρας, Αἰκατερίνης, Εὐδοκίας καὶ Μαρίας, Εἰρήνης τῆς διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀγγελικοῦ σχήματος μετονομασθείσης Εὐγενίας μοναχῆς καὶ Θεοδώρας τῆς διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀγγελικοῦ σχήματος μετονομασθείσης Εὐγενίας μοναχῆς, τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων αὐγουστῶν, αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ'.

Fol. 165^v: Γερμανοῦ, Ταρασίου, Νικήφору καὶ Μεθοδίου τῶν ἀοιδίμων πατριαρχῶν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη. Ἰγνατίου, Φωτίου, Στεφάνου καὶ Ἀντωνίου, Νικολάου καὶ Εὐθυμίου, Στεφάνου, Τρύφωνος, Θεοφυλάκτου, Πολυεύκτου, Ἀντωνίου, Νικολάου καὶ Σισινίου, Σεργίου, Εὐσταθίου, Ἀλεξίου, Μιχαήλ, Κωνσταντίνου, Ἰωάννου, Κοσμά, Εὐστρατίου καὶ Νικολάου, Μιχαήλ, Θεοδώρου, Μαξίμου, Μανουήλ, Γερμανοῦ τοῦ διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀγγελικοῦ σχήματος μετονομασθέντος Γεωργίου μοναχοῦ, Μεθοδίου τοῦ διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ σχήματος μετονομασθέντος Ἀκακίου μοναχοῦ, καὶ Μανουήλ τοῦ διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀγγελικοῦ σχήματος μετονομασθέντος Ματθαίου μοναχοῦ, Ἀρσενίου καὶ Ἰωσήφ, τῶν ἀγιωτάτων οἰκουμενικῶν πατριαρχῶν, αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ'.

From fol. 166^r to 167^v the text of the Synodicon continues (Uspenskij, pp. 16–18): Τοῖς τὰ ἑλληνικά ... τῶν ὀρθοδόξων πίστει ἐναντίοις, ἀνάθεμα. Then follows (167^v), Τοῖς τὸ πρόσλημμα δοῦλον λέγουσι καὶ ἀπλῶς πᾶσι τοῖς ῥηθεῖσι κεφαλαίοις παρὰ τοῦ ἐκθεμένου αὐτά, ἀνάθεμα. The next two lines, which were the last of the fourteenth-century insertion begun on fol. 161^r, have been erased; but it is not difficult to read Πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῶν βασιλέων, Ἀνδρονίκου ... (i. e. Andronicus II).

Below this, in a different hand, comes: Ἀννης τῆς εὐσεβεστάτης αὐγούστης τῆς διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀγγελικοῦ σχήματος μετονομασθείσης Ἀναστασίας μοναχῆς, αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη.¹¹ Then,

¹¹ See note 5, *supra*.

the anathema of Uspenskij, p. 10, "Ἀπαντα τὰ παρὰ ... πραχθησόμενα, ἀνάθεμα α'. And finally, at the bottom, Μιχαήλ του ὀρθοδόξου βασιλέως καὶ Θεοδώρας τῆς αὐτοῦ μητρὸς αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ'.

Now, the final two entries on fol. 167^v, all of fol. 168, and fol. 169^r are, with the exception of a few later additions in text or margins, the insertion of a single hand, again of the fourteenth century, and datable on internal evidence to the years 1322–1332 (*infra*, p. 235): and since this second insertion begins on the last page of the first, the first (fols. 161–167), though also of the fourteenth century, must antedate the second.

Fol. 168^r begins with two later entries in the upper margin: Ἰωάννου τοῦ ὀρθοδοξοτάτου βασιλέως τοῦ διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀγγελικοῦ σχήματος μετονομασθέντος Ἰωάσαφ μοναχοῦ αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη, and Μανουήλ τοῦ ὀρθοδοξοτάτου δεσπότης ἡμῶν τοῦ διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀγγελικοῦ σχήματος μετονομασθέντος Μακαρίου μοναχοῦ αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη. The main text then begins, with the following list of emperors:

Κωνσταντίνου, Βασιλείου καὶ Κωνσταντίνου, Λέοντος καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου, Χριστοφόρου καὶ Ῥωμανοῦ, Κωνσταντίνου καὶ Ῥωμανοῦ, Νικηφόρου καὶ Ἰωάννου, Βασιλείου καὶ Κωνσταντίνου, Ῥωμανοῦ καὶ Μιχαήλ, Ἰωάννου, Κωνσταντίνου, Μιχαήλ, Ἰσακίου, Κωνσταντίνου, Ῥωμανοῦ, Μιχαήλ, Νικηφόρου καὶ Ἀνδρονίκου, Ἰσακίου, Ἀλεξίου, Ἰωάννου καὶ Ἀλεξίου, Ματθαίου μοναχοῦ, καὶ Ἀλεξίου, Θεοδώρου, Ἰωάννου, καὶ Θεοδώρου τῶν τὴν οὐράνιον βασιλείαν τῆς ἐπιγείου ἀλλαξαμένων, αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη α'. Next, inserted in another hand, comes: Ἀνδρονίκου τοῦ ὀρθοδοξοτάτου καὶ ἡγιασμένου βασιλέως τοῦ μετονομασθέντος διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀγγελικοῦ σχήματος Ἀντωνίου μοναχοῦ, αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ'. The main text then resumes, with: Μιχαήλ τοῦ ὀρθοδοξοτάτου καὶ ἡγιασμένου βασιλέως ἡμῶν αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ'. And below this, again in a different hand: Ἀνδρονίκου τοῦ ὀρθοδοξοτάτου καὶ ἡγιασμένου βασιλέως ἡμῶν αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ'.

The main text then proceeds with the following list of Augustas:

Ἑλένης, Εὐδοκίας, Θεοφανοῦς, Θεοδώρας, Ἑλένης, Θεοφανοῦς, Σοφίας, Θεοδώρας, Ζωῆς, Θεοδώρας, Αἰκατερίνης, Εἰρήνης, Εὐδοκίας, Μαρίας, Εἰρήνης, Ζένης μοναχῆς καὶ Ζένης μοναχῆς, Ἀννης, Εἰρήνης μετονομασθείσης Εὐγενείας μοναχῆς, Ἑλένης, τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων αὐγουστῶν, αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη α': and continues, still in the same hand, with

Θεοδώρας τῆς εὐσεβεστάτης καὶ ἡγιασμένης αὐγουστῆς τῆς διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀγγελικοῦ σχήματος μετονομασθείσης Εὐγενείας μοναχῆς αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ', and Εἰρήνης τῆς εὐσεβεστάτης καὶ ἡγιασμένης αὐγουστῆς

The patriarchal commemorations begin next, with Γερμανοῦ, Ταρασίου, Νικηφόρου καὶ Μεθοδίου τῶν ἀοιδ ... αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ': beneath which, in the lower margin, another hand has added Μαρίας τῆς εὐσεβεστάτης αὐγουστῆς τῆς διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀγγελικοῦ σχήματος μετονομασθείσης Ζένης μοναχῆς, αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη.

Fol. 168^v (fig. 7) begins with an insertion in the upper margin, Γρηγορίου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου μητροπολίτου Λακεδαιμονίας, αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη, after which the main text continues the patriarchal list begun on the recto: Ἰγνατίου, Φωτίου, Στεφάνου καὶ Ἀντωνίου, Νικολάου, Εὐθυμίου, Στεφάνου, Τρύφωνος, Θεοφυλάκτου, Πολυεύκτου, Ἀντωνίου, Νικολάου, Σισινίου, Σεργίου, Εὐσταθίου, Ἀλεξίου, Μιχαήλ, Κωνσταντίνου, Ἰωάννου, Εὐστρατίου, Κοσμᾶ, Νικολάου, Ἰωάννου, Λέοντος, Μιχαήλ, Κωνσταντίνου, Θεοδούλου, Λουκᾶ, Μιχαήλ καὶ Χαρίτωνος, Βασιλείου, Νικήτα, (? Γεωργίου), Γερμανοῦ καὶ Μανουήλ τῶν ὀρθοδόξων πατριαρχῶν, αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ'. Two separate commemorations follow, in the same hand: Ἀρσενίου τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου καὶ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου καὶ νέου ὁμολογητοῦ (one word erased) αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ'. Ἰωσήφ τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου καὶ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου καὶ νέου ὁμολογητοῦ (one word erased) αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ'. Then, inserted in faint ink, by another hand: (Ἰσι)δώρου τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου καὶ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου αἰωνία (ἡ μνήμη). Two notes in the left margin are illegible.

The main text continues with the episcopal list of Lacedaemonia, as follows: Ἰωάννου, Πυθανοῦ [sic: ?Ποθεινοῦ], Εἰρηναίου, Βασιλείου, Θεοκλήτου, Βασιλείου καὶ Νικολάου, Εὐσταθίου, Λέοντος, Ἰωάννου καὶ Θεοπέμπτου, Θεοδοσίου, Λουκᾶ, Ἰωάννου, Θεοδώρου, Μιχαήλ, Σωτηρίχου, Βασιλείου, Ἰωάννου, Ἰωάννου μοναχοῦ, Νικήτα, Ἰωάννου, Νικήτα, Θεράποντος μοναχοῦ, Ἰωάννου τοῦ διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀγγελικοῦ σχήματος μετονομασθέντος Ἰωσήφ μοναχοῦ [in left margin ... μακαριωτάτου μ(η)τροπολ(ι)τ(ου) ... (? αἰωνία) ἡ μνήμη] τῶν μακαριωτάτων μητροπολιτῶν Λακεδαιμονίας, αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ'. Then, in the same hand: Νικηφόρου τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου μητροπολίτου Κρήτης καὶ προέδρου Λακεδαιμονίας (? αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ'). Ἡ ἀγία Τριάς αὐτοὺς ἐδόξασεν. Αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ'. In the lower margin, another hand has added, in very faint ink: Ἀνθίμου τοῦ

ἀγιωτάτου μητροπολίτου Κρήτης καὶ νέου ὁμολογητοῦ αἰωνία ἡ μνήμη γ'. Another addition at the bottom of the left margin has been torn off, leaving only ... γ' ... ονίας ... γ'.

Fol. 169^r, the last page of this second fourteenth-century insertion, concludes with the salutations and benediction of Uspenskij, p. 40: Πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῶν βασιλέων, κτλ. and, Τούτων τοῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐσεβείας ... καὶ πάντων (αὐτοῦ τῶν) ἁγίων, ἀμήν.

In fol. 170^r (fig. 8) we return to the original, eleventh-century text. This folio repeats, in fragmentary form, the benediction written by the fourteenth-century hand on fol. 169^r. And fol. 170^v concludes with the original eleventh-century colophon:

(μν)ήσθητι Κύριε τοῦ δούλου
(σου) Θεοφυλάκτου ἀνα-
(ξί)ου κουβουκλεισίου καὶ δομεστίκου
(εὐ)αγοῦς πατριαρχικοῦ
(σεκ)ρέτου Ἀντιοχείας καὶ χαρίσαι
(αὐ)τῷ ὑγίαν καὶ ἄφασιν ἀμαρτιῶν.

2. Selection of Conciliar Texts

The selection of texts contained in our MS is of some interest. Of the twenty-two Greek MSS of the Synodicon known to Mošin,¹² two, the *Matrit. O. 2* (sixteenth century) and the *Monac. gr. 380* (twelfth century) contain, in addition to the Synodicon of Orthodoxy, the *horos* of the Seventh Council. Apparently only one Greek MS, among those hitherto known, had, when it was complete, more or less the same contents as ours, viz. a MS in the National Library of Sofia, No. 289 (55), said to be of the fifteenth or sixteenth century, which is appended to the Bulgarian version of the Synodicon. In its present fragmentary condition the Greek MS at Sofia contains part of the *horos* of Chalcedon as well as those of the Sixth and Seventh Councils; originally it may also have included the *horos* of 920 since part of this text appears in the Bulgarian version.¹³ The Serbian translation of the Synodicon, in a MS of the late fourteenth century belonging to

the monastery of the Trinity near Plevlje in Herzegovina, stands even closer to the Holkham MS in that it contains the very same conciliar texts.¹⁴ Concerning the origin of the Serbian version, Mošin concludes that it was made by St. Savva between the years 1201 and 1204 on the basis of a Russian MS which, in turn, reproduced a Greek redaction of the time of Alexius I Comnenus with the *horoi* of the Councils, but without the accretions of the late eleventh and twelfth centuries.¹⁵ The Holkham MS, which is even earlier in date than this presumed archetype, is therefore of fundamental importance for the study of the Slavic Synodica. That the contents of our MS represent an exception rather than the rule is indicated not only by the absence of any other Greek MS containing exactly the same texts, but also by an indication emanating—by a strange coincidence—from the see of Antioch at the end of the eleventh century. In an opusculum concerning the observance of the fast of the Holy Virgin, Anastasius bishop of Caesarea (presumably Caesarea Philippi) states that he had before him a Synodicon containing the *horoi* of three Councils, and three only: two of these dealt with matters of faith, while the third was the Union of 920.¹⁶

A question that may be raised at this point is to what extent the Holkham MS is complete in its present condition. Unfortunately, many of the quire-marks have been either completely or partly amputated when the pages were trimmed; enough of them remain, however, to show that two gatherings are missing. The constitution of the MS. is, in brief, as follows:

Quire 1, a *ternio*, fols. 1–6. No quire-mark.

Quire 2, a quaternion, fols. 7–14. No quire-mark.

Quire 3, a quaternion, fols. 15–22. No quire-mark.

Quire 4, a quaternion, fols. 23–30. No quire-mark.

¹² Mošin, *op. cit.*, p. 321 f.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 371.

¹⁴ PG 127, col. 520B: τρεῖς δὲ καὶ μόνας συνόδους ἔχει τὸ τοιοῦτον βιβλίον· καὶ αἱ μὲν δύο τούτων περὶ πίστεως διαλέγονται, ἡ δὲ ἑτέρα περὶ γάμων διαφοράς, ἐξ οὗ καὶ τῆς Ἐνώσεως λέγεται. Cf. V. Grumel, "Le jeûne del' Assomption dans l'Eglise grecque," *Echos d'Orient*, XXXII (1933), p. 174.

¹² "Serbskaja redaktsija Sinodika v nedelju Pravoslavija," *Vizant. Vremennik*, XVI (1959), p. 318 ff.

¹³ M. G. Popruženko, "Sinodik tsarja Borisa," *Izvest. Russk. Arkheol. Inst. v Konstant.*, V (1900), p. viiiff.; *id.*, *Sinodik tsarja Borila*, Blgarski starini, VIII (Sofia, 1928), p. iif.

- Quire 5, a quaternion, fols. 31–38. On fol. 31^r is the mark 5'.
- Quire 6, a quaternion, fols. 39–46. On fol. 39^r is the mark 1'.
- Quire 7, a quaternion, fols. 47–54. No quire-mark.
- Quire 8, a quaternion, fols. 55–62. No quire-mark.
- Quire 9, a folded sheet (63–65) with a single folio (64) inserted in between. No quire-mark.

From fol. 66 onward the gatherings are regular and are marked as follows: 1<β'> on fol. 66^r; 1<γ'> on fol. 74^r; 1<δ'> on fol. 82^r; 1ε' on fol. 90^r; 1<ς'> on fol. 98^r; 1ι' on fol. 106^r; 1<η'> on fol. 114^r; κ' on fol. 128^r; κ<α'> on fol. 136^r; κ<β'> on fol. 144^r; κγ' on fol. 152^r; κδ' on fol. 160^r. Fols. 161–169, a later insertion, form a *quinio*. Fol. 170, part of the original codex, is a single sheet.

From this it follows that two gatherings are missing: the first before fol. 31, probably between fols. 22 and 23 since, as we have seen, the text breaks off on fol. 22^v; the second either between fols. 46 and 47 or between 65 and 66, since between 54 and 55 the text continues without interruption. The gap between quire-marks 18 and 20 is explained by the insertion of the paper fols. 122–127 which bear no quire-mark, but must have been reckoned as no. 19. This consideration, as well as the character of the lettering, indicates that the quire-marks are a late addition, of the fifteenth century at the earliest.

It is, of course, impossible to determine precisely what was contained in the lost gatherings. The fact, however, that only two gatherings are missing and that these were not juxtaposed suggests that they could not have contained any additional *horoi* belonging to the original eleventh-century MS, since each *horos* occupies about three gatherings. The analogy of the Serbian version is also evidence that the original part of our MS is, except for minor gaps, complete as it stands. It is quite likely, on the other hand, that the two missing gatherings were later insertions, like fols. 122–127, containing perhaps some of the other condemnations that are normally attached to the Synodicon of Orthodoxy.

3. *Dates of the Liturgical Commemorations*

Our MS, as we have seen, gives the following dates for the commemoration of the Councils it contains:

1. Union of 920: no date given.
2. Council of Chalcedon: July 16, if it happens to be a Sunday; if not, either the previous or following Sunday.
3. Council of 536: the Sunday following No. 2.
4. Sixth Council: the Sunday after the feast of the Exaltation (Sept. 14).
5. Seventh Council: October 11, if it is a Sunday; if not, either the previous or following Sunday.
6. Feast of Orthodoxy: Sunday of Orthodoxy (first Sunday of Lent).

The feast of the Union, which does not appear in the Synaxaria, was normally celebrated on the Sunday preceding the Council of Chalcedon, i.e. between July 6 and 12.¹⁷ The protocol for that day, as laid down in the *De Cerimoniis*, included an imperial procession to the churches of St. Sophia and St. Irene.¹⁸ Balsamon states that the Tome of the Union was read from the ambo in the month of July.¹⁹

The dates given for the other Councils represent the normal practice of the Church of Constantinople. In the Typicon of the Great Church, believed to have been compiled in the early ninth century and revised *ca.* 880, we already find the same dates, viz. the Council of Chalcedon on July 16, the Fifth Council on the Sunday following, the Sixth on September 15 and the Seventh on October 11.²⁰ The Synaxaria follow suit.²¹ The only point deserving of comment is the confusion between the Council of 536 and the Fifth Oecumenical

¹⁷ M. Gedeon, Βυζαντινὸν ἑορτολόγιον (Constantinople, 1899), p. 128; cf. I. Mansvetov, *Tserkovnyj ustav* (Moscow, 1885), p. 240f., who also gives the date of June 15.

¹⁸ Bonn ed., p. 186f.

¹⁹ PG 119, col. 1260A; Zachariä von Lingenthal, *Jus graeco-romanum*, III, p. 228, note 4.

²⁰ A. Dmitrievskij, *Opisanie liturgičeskikh rukopisej*, I (Kiev, 1895), pp. 6, 13, 92, 93. Cf. N. Krasnosel'tsev, "Tipik tserkvi Sv. Sofii," *Letopis' Ist.-Filol. Obšč. pri Imp. Novoross. Univ.*, II, *Vizant. Otdel.*, I (Odessa, 1892), p. 221 ff. The Typicon does not mention the Feast of Orthodoxy.

²¹ *Synax. eccl. Constant.*, ed. Delehaye (*Propylaeum ad ASS Nov.*), cols. 55–56, 132, 824, 826, 842.

(553), a confusion that is repeated in the Serbian version of the Synodicon. Mošin²² has attempted to explain the substitution of the former Council for the latter on the grounds that the Council of 553 was directed against Nestorianism, whereas in 843 the compilers of the Synodicon wished (or so he argues) to bypass the whole problem of Nestorianism. Such an explanation is, however, superfluous, since the Councils of 536 and 553 were often confused or treated as one: Photius, for example, in his famous letter to King Boris of Bulgaria considers the two Councils as one which he calls the Fifth Oecumenical.²³ There is no reason to doubt, therefore, that in our Synodicon the *horos* of 536 was included as if it was that of the Fifth Council. Furthermore, our MS which, as we have seen, may be regarded as an ancestor of the Serbian version, consistently inserts a condemnation of the Nestorians and Jacobites after each Council.

The place which the recitation of conciliar *horoi* occupied in the church service is made clear by the Typicon of the Great Church. The instructions contained therein are particularly explicit in the case of the First and Fourth Councils.²⁴ For the latter, the reading of the *horos* came after the *Trisagion* and was followed by the *prokeimenon* and lections from the Epistle to the Hebrews and from Matthew. Some such order must have been observed for the other Councils as well.

4. Date of the Antioch Synodicon.

The date of the original part of our MS can be determined within very narrow limits thanks to the commemorations of emperors, empresses, and patriarchs.

The list of deceased emperors extends from Basil I (867–886) and his eldest son Constantine († 879) down to Michael IV (1034–1041). The detested Michael V Calaphates (1041–1042) has been, of course, omitted. The reigning emperors are Constantine IX (1042–1055) and Theodora. Hence our Synodicon must

have been composed before the death of Constantine IX on January 11, 1055.

The list of empresses is much shorter and not in strict chronological order. It consists of Eudocia, wife of Basil I; Theophano, first wife of Leo VI; Theodora, wife of John I; Helen, wife of Constantine VII; Theophano, the notorious wife of Romanus II and of Nicephorus II Phocas; and finally Zoe, wife of Romanus III, Michael IV and Constantine IX. Since Zoe died in 1050, our Synodicon must be later than this date.

The list of Constantinopolitan patriarchs does not help us further to narrow down the date of the MS. The continuous list on fol. 19^r goes from Ignatius (847–858, 867–877) down to Alexius Studites (1025–1043). It is in chronological order but omits Basil I Skamandrenos (970–974). Our Synodicon was therefore written under Michael I Kerularios (1043–1058).

The list of Antiochene patriarchs is discussed in the next section. It proves that our Synodicon must have been written before the appointment of Patriarch Peter III in the spring of 1052, so that the date of the MS must be 1050–1052.

5. The Patriarchs of Antioch.

The episcopal commemorations (see *supra*, p. 226) make it clear that we are dealing with a Synodicon of the Church of Antioch. It is true that the episcopal list of Antioch appears in the Synodica of other Churches for the reason that after the Byzantine reconquest of Antioch (969) its patriarchs were appointed directly from Constantinople;²⁵ in our case, however, the patriarchs of Antioch are commemorated before those of Constantinople, which surely indicates that our MS was written for the see of Antioch. This conclusion is further supported by the scribe's colophon.

The incumbent Patriarch of Antioch is Sophronius. His dead predecessors are listed as follows:

1. Christopher
2. Theodore
3. Agapius
4. John
5. Nicholas

²² *Op. cit.*, p. 327.

²³ Φωτίου . . . ἐπιστολαί, ed. N. Valettas (London, 1864), p. 212 ff. The two Councils are confused in the Synaxarion, ed. Delehaye, col. 842.

²⁴ Dmitrievskij, *op. cit.*, pp. 92–93, 181. Cf. Kransosel'tsev, *loc. cit.*

²⁵ Cf. N. Cappuyns in *Echos d'Orient*, XXXIII (1934), pp. 208–209.

6. Elias
7. Theodore
8. Basil

The list of departed patriarchs offers no difficulty. Christopher (960–969) was the last Melkite patriarch before the Byzantine conquest. The first Byzantine appointee was one Eustratius, but apparently he never held office and his name does not figure in any Synodicon.²⁶ He was followed by Theodore II (970–976), Agapius I (978–996), John III (996–1021), Nicholas II (1025–1030), Elias II (1032–1033), Theodore III (1034–1042) and Basil II (exact dates undetermined). Sophronius is entirely unknown. He was followed by Peter III who was in office from the spring of 1052 until after August 1056.²⁷ We must therefore concentrate our attention on the last three.

At once we are met with a difficulty. In his enthronistic letter to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Peter III intimates that his immediate predecessor had been Basil. These are his words: "In the meantime, Basil the Bishop of Antioch had departed to God. The Emperor's mind was agitated by tempests of cares: who was to be bishop and, with knowledge, stand in authority over the people of the Lord? At different times different men came to mind, and many were considered, until [the Emperor] called us who knew nothing whatever of his counsels," etc.²⁸ This passage suggests that there was a considerable hiatus between Basil's death and Peter's appointment. At this time there appears to have been some discontent at Antioch, for in another letter which Peter wrote immediately after his consecration to the clergy of Antioch, he urges his addressees who, as he believes, had greatly desired his appointment to "lay aside all despondency and sorrow."²⁹ The ecclesiastical relations between Constantinople and Antioch during this period were

accompanied by some friction. The Syrians were naturally desirous of selecting their own patriarchs instead of having strangers imposed upon them from Constantinople; to make matters worse, the Patriarch John III (996–1021) had ceded the right of the patriarchs of Antioch to be ordained by their own metropolitans, instead of which they were to be consecrated by the patriarch of Constantinople, a custom that apparently persisted down to the Latin conquest. Peter III, although ordained in the capital, was by birth a native of Antioch and he later took decisive action to defend the rights of his see against the encroachments of Michael Kerularios.³⁰

Was Sophronius an appointee of the local Syrian Church who did not receive recognition from Constantinople? Or was he, on the contrary, an imperial appointee, one of those "many" who were considered for the post, but who perchance was so ill-received at Antioch that he had to be replaced by a native, Peter III? Whichever of the two alternatives is preferred, Sophronius must have been patriarch for a very short time, probably in 1051; and if Peter III ignores him (as do later Synodica), he must have had good reason for doing so. The name of Sophronius should, however, be added to the episcopal list of Antioch. By a strange coincidence, a Sophronius was at about the same time patriarch of Jerusalem (from before 1059 till after 1064).³¹ Whether these were one and the same person we are unable to say.

6. The Fourteenth-Century Commemorative Lists.

The list of emperors, augustas, and patriarchs that appear on fol. 165 are part of the uniform addition, made in an early fourteenth-century hand, which occupies fols. 161–167. There are no separate, additional commemorations. The list of emperors ends with Theodore II († 1258). The list of augustas ends with the wife of Michael VIII, Theodora

²⁶ V. Grumel, "Le patriarcat et les patriarches d'Antioche sous la seconde domination byzantine," *ibid.*, p. 130ff.

²⁷ On Peter, see A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerullarios*, II (Paderborn, 1930), p. 416ff.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 440.

²⁹ A. Michel, "Die Botschaft Petros' III. von Antiochia an seine Stadt über seine Ernennung," *BZ*, XXXVIII (1938), p. 117: ἀπόθεσθε πᾶσαν ἀθυμίαν καὶ λύπην, etc.

³⁰ Grumel, *op. cit.*, p. 140f. Cf. also the same author's "Les patriarches grecs d'Antioche du nom de Jean," *Echos d'Orient*, XXXII (1933), p. 279ff.

³¹ Following the dates of Grumel, *La chronologie*, *Traité d'études byzantines*, I (Paris, 1958), p. 452.

(† 1303). The last patriarch commemorated is Joseph I († 1283). The two latter dates indicate that the lists were compiled in the reign of Andronicus II, whose father Michael VIII is omitted as heretical. This is confirmed by a scrutiny of the two erased lines which concluded the insertion on fol. 167^v. In this place would normally come the salutation of the reigning emperors: and in fact, as we saw, the name of Andronicus is visible at the beginning of the second line. The erasure was no doubt made to allow of the continuance in use of the Synodicon: and we find Andronicus II's death commemorated on the following page (168^r).

Since fols. 161–167 need not be dated much after 1303, since they must antedate fols. 168–169^r, and since they contain nothing relevant to the bishopric of Lacedaemonia, it is reasonable to suppose that they were inserted by Nicephorus Moschopoulos himself, by way of completing and bringing up to date his Synodicon before presenting it to his church of St. Demetrios.

The lists which follow in another hand on fol. 168, and which include the episcopal list of Lacedaemonia itself, were added after the death of Nicephorus Moschopoulos (i. e. after 1322), which is commemorated in the same hand as wrote the main text of this insertion. We can be even more precise as to the date of the addition. The last emperor mentioned in the original insertion is Michael IX († 1320), who is separately commemorated between the continuous lists of emperors and augustas. His father Andronicus II, on the other hand, who died in 1332, is squeezed in above him in quite a different script; and the other separate commemorations on this page, of Andronicus III († 1341) and, in the upper margin, of John VI († 1383) and of his son the Despot Manuel († 1380), are again in different hands. Therefore, the main text of fols. 168^r–169^r was inserted between 1322 (when Nicephorus Moschopoulos was still alive: *infra*, p. 241) and 1332; and was probably put in by, or at the instance of, the then bishop Gregory Voutás (*infra*, p. 242).

Now, this "Gregorian" insertion, though it covers much of the same ground as the "Nicephoran" insertion, is not a copy of the latter, but was probably copied from another, local, record, which may have been the pre-

vious Synodicon superseded by the handsome gift of Nicephorus Moschopoulos.

We have next to consider the lists provided by this "Gregorian" addition. For though we now know the date when it was written into our codex, we have yet to find the date when its main, continuous lists themselves were compiled; and this question has some bearing on the identification of at least one bishop in the episcopal list of Lacedaemonia (*infra*, p. 237). The last emperor commemorated is again Theodore II († 1258); but the last augusta is not Theodora († 1303), who is here separately commemorated, but Theodore's own wife Helen, who predeceased him. And the last patriarch in the continuous list is not Joseph I, but Manuel II († 1255). It is clear that these continuous lists of the "Gregorian" insertion date from the period of the recovery of Byzantium and Peloponnese under Michael VIII (1261–1262). The separate commemorations *in the same hand* date from between this epoch and 1322–32 (Michael IX, Theodora, Irene († 1317), and the Patriarchs Arsenios († 1273) and Joseph I); and those later than 1332 were added as and where occasion served.

It would seem that no additions (except for the "repair" fols. 122–127) were made to the Synodicon after the commemoration of the Despot Manuel in 1380 and of his father in 1383. John V († 1391) is not commemorated except on fol. 125^r (*supra*, p. 228). Anthimos of Crete, who is apparently the last to be commemorated on fol. 168^v, died in or about the year 1370 (*infra*, p. 242); and the Patriarch Isidore twenty years before him.

7. *The Episcopal List of Lacedaemonia.*

The patriarchal list of fol. 168^v is followed by the list of the local (bishops and) metropolitans of Lacedaemonia itself. This is the regular practice in the Synodicon of a metropolitan see,³² such as Lacedaemonia had been since 1082–1083.³³ A simple bishopric, such for example as Syvrita,³⁴ would record only the archbishops of its metropolitan see and its own bishops, omitting the Patriarchal list.

³² Laurent, *Echos d'Orient*, XXX (1931), p. 70.

³³ Dölger, *Regesten*, II, 30, no: 1086.

³⁴ Laurent, *Echos d'Orient*, XXXII (1933), pp. 388–389.

Episcopal lists hitherto discovered—they are fewer than might have been expected—have been discussed by Petit, Cappuyns, and, especially, Laurent, to whose learning and industry workers in this field are deeply indebted.³⁵ Such lists, Laurent has emphasized, are most unlikely to be complete. Omissions are due in some cases to ignorance or carelessness; in others they are deliberate, for reasons of theological odium.³⁶ Even of the names which do appear some may have become corrupted in the course of repeated transcription over the centuries. But these disadvantages are outweighed by the very solid advantage that the lists, however incomplete, are undoubtedly in chronological order: a rule which seems to admit of no exceptions.³⁷

The list which appears on fol. 168^v of our MS is as follows:

- | | |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| 1. John | 14. John |
| 2. Potheinos | 15. Theodoros |
| 3. Eirenaios | 16. Michael |
| 4. Basil | 17. Soterichos |
| 5. Theokletos | 18. Basil |
| 6. Basil | 19. John |
| 7. Nicholas | 20. John the monk |
| 8. Eustathios | 21. Niketas |
| 9. Leo | 22. John |
| 10. John | 23. Niketas |
| 11. Theopemptos | 24. Therapon the monk |
| 12. Theodosios | 25. John, the monk |
| 13. Luke | Joseph |

These are commemorated continuously, and without distinction, as οἱ μακαριώτατοι μητροπολίται Λακεδαιμονίας. Then follows no: 26, Nicephorus. Then, in the upper margin, no. 27, Gregory. Lastly, in the lower margin, comes the commemoration of Anthimos, metropolitan of Crete, the "new confessor."

Leaving aside for the moment the later, separate commemorations, which are all of the fourteenth century, we must first consider the probable *termini post et ante* of the main, continuous list, nos. 1–25 inclusive. These are all denominated "metropolitans," a term

which, if taken literally, would imply that all of them fall in the period after 1082–1083. But this clearly is not so. The list fails to distinguish between the earlier status of ἐπίσκοπος and the later status of μητροπολίτης, and lumps them all together as metropolitans, a natural and pardonable inaccuracy.

As we know nothing of nos. 1–4 except their names, and as their *terminus ante* is 869, which is the date of no. 5, it is theoretically possible that they have been culled from much earlier periods than the first half of the ninth century. This would not be unexampled. In the list of Cyprus³⁸ at least the first eleven names are datable before the end of the eighth century. The list of Adrianople contains two bishops of the fourth century. That of Monemvasia starts with a bishop of the late eighth century, before leaping to the middle of the tenth.³⁹ But this seems to be unlikely in the list of Lacedaemonia. None of the first four names is that of a figure celebrated in ecclesiastical history, which might ensure the survival of his fame from a more remote past. Moreover, neither of the two bishops whose names we find in earlier centuries—Hosios in 458 and Theodosios in 681⁴⁰—occurs in our list. We shall probably be right in placing John, Potheinos, Eirenaios, and Basil in the years between 843 and 869, or possibly in the years between 805 and 869, allowing for the gap between 815 and 843. For, in or about 805, as is well known, Patras was elevated to the status of a metropolis, and Lacedaemonia, hitherto in the diocese of Corinth, became a suffragan of the new see. This step was a consequence of the recovery of much of Peloponnesus by Nicephorus I after two centuries of Slav occupation;⁴¹ and it would have been a suitable

³⁸ Cappuyns, *Byzantion*, X (1935), p. 498.

³⁹ Laurent, *Echos d'Orient*, XXXII (1933), p. 143.

⁴⁰ E. Schwartz, *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, II, 5 (Berlin, Leipzig, 1936) 89; Mansi, XI, 674. The latter, Theodosios, signed the acts of the Sixth Council in 681: his name should therefore be added to that of Stephen of Corinth, who, says A. Bon, *Péloponnèse byzantin* (Paris, 1951), p. 103, "seul a figuré pour la Grèce et le Péloponnèse."

⁴¹ Grumel, *Les regestes*, no. 371; H.-G. Beck, *Kirche u. Theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (Munich, 1959), p. 179; Bon, *Péloponnèse byzantin*, pp. 43–47.

³⁵ These publications are listed by Grumel, *Les regestes*, no: 425; add since then the lists of Adrianople, Laurent, *Echos d'Orient*, XXXVIII (1939), pp. 1–34, and Athens, *id.*, *Mémorial L. Petit* (Bucarest, 1948), pp. 272–289.

³⁶ Laurent, *Echos d'Orient*, XXX (1931), pp. 71–72; *id.*, *Mémorial L. Petit*, 274.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

moment to begin the compilation of regular records once again, especially as it coincided with the refounding and rebuilding of Lacedaemonia itself.⁴²

The *terminus ante* of the main or continuous list is equally hard to determine with accuracy. Somewhere between no. 22, who is firmly dated to 1173 (*infra*, p. 241), and no. 26, Nicephorus, whose presidency of the see began between 1285 and 1289,⁴³ comes the hiatus of half a century (*ca.* 1206–1262) which corresponds to the Frankish occupation. In the year 1285 a certain Bishop John of Lacedaemonia, who was probably the immediate predecessor of our no. 26, signed the acts of the Second Synod of Blachernae.⁴⁴ It is tempting to identify this John with our no. 25, John renamed Joseph. If we do so, we might place the hiatus after no. 24, Therapon, and conclude that Therapon was bishop at the time of the Frankish conquest. This is quite uncertain. As we saw *supra* (p. 235), the continuous lists of emperors and augustas run down to Theodore II Laskaris († 1258) and his wife Helen, who predeceased him. The continuous list of patriarchs ends with Manuel II († 1255). The first emperor to be separately commemorated is Michael IX († 1320), and the first augusta is the wife of Michael VIII, Theodora († 1303): Michael VIII himself is of course deliberately omitted. The first separately commemorated patriarch, on the other hand, is Arsenios († 1273). If the continuous lists of emperors and augustas, patriarchs of Constantinople, and metropolitans of Lacedaemonia, represent contemporary recensions, as seems most likely, then they must have been compiled between 1258 and 1273, perhaps shortly after the recovery of Constantinople and Peloponnesus by Michael VIII (1261–1262). Now, our no. 25, John-Joseph, falls within the continuous list of metropolitans of Lacedaemonia; and if this list is contemporary with the others, it must finish in the third quarter of the thirteenth century, or more probably in the first, since after 1206 there were no more Orthodox metropolitans of La-

cedaemonia until its recovery from the Franks. This line of reasoning would suggest our placing no. 25⁴⁵ at or before the Frankish conquest; and not identifying him with the John of the Blachernae Synod in 1285. This latter John would then be missing from our list; and this omission could not be explained on the same probable ground as that of his predecessor Theodosios (*infra*, p. 241), since, as a signatory of the Tomus of Blachernae, John was a partisan of the orthodox and anti-unionist policies of Andronicus II, of his patriarch Gregory, and of John's own successor Nicephorus Moschopoulos, who signed the same document as metropolitan of Crete. The question cannot be solved without fuller knowledge of the circumstances in which Nicephorus shortly afterwards took over the presidency of the see of Lacedaemonia.⁴⁶ Meanwhile, on the evidence of the continuous lists, it seems the most probable hypothesis that our nos. 1–25 are the bishops and metropolitans of Lacedaemonia from 843 (or Orthodox bishops from 805) until *ca.* 1206.

In the list itself, as we have noted, the first four names are not known elsewhere. No. 5 is Theokletos. He signed the acts of the anti-Photian Council of 869–870.⁴⁷ He was afterwards regarded, at least in Lacedaemonia, as a saint; and his Life was written, probably in the early eleventh century, at the instance of the then Bishop Theodoros.⁴⁸ The Life is a simple encomium, with almost no factual information at all,⁴⁹ which the

⁴⁵ More light might perhaps be cast on this problem if we could read the truncated note in the left margin of the folio, which stands opposite to John, and may refer to him.

⁴⁶ Nicephorus Gregoras, Bonn. ed., I, 173/1–5, states that the signatories of Blachernae were afterwards justly punished by shameful expulsion from their sees (ἀσχηστά τῶν οικείων ἐξελασθέντων θρόνων). Laurent (*Echos d'Orient*, XXVI [1927], p. 137) rightly notes that Nicephorus Moschopoulos, one of them, died while still metropolitan of Crete. However, Nicephorus had meantime been made proedros of Lacedaemonia *ca.* 1289, and was removed from this see *ca.* 1316. John of Lacedaemonia may similarly have been ousted to make room for Nicephorus.

⁴⁷ Mansi, XVI, 159, 195.

⁴⁸ Ed. N. A. Bees, *Vizantijskoe Obozrenie*, II (1916), Supplement 1, 1–54; ed. A. Sgouritsas (apparently without knowledge of Bees' edition), *Θεολογία*, XXVII (1956), pp. 567–593.

⁴⁹ Bees, 18–19.

⁴² Unless the whole story is a fabrication, as S. P. Kyriakidis believes: *Βυζαντινὰ Μελέται*, VI (Salonika, 1947), pp. 59–64.

⁴³ Manousakas, *Ἑλληνικά*, XV (1957), p. 240.

⁴⁴ Laurent, *Echos d'Orient*, XXVI (1927), p. 146.

author blames on the lapse of time. It may, however, be used inferentially in one important matter. The Photian Council of 879 was signed by one Antonios as bishop of Lacedaemonia,⁵⁰ who does not occur in our list, and of whom, unless he were the later Patriarch Antony Kauleas, nothing else is known. This implies either that by 879 Theokletos was dead, or else that he had been turned out of his see as an anti-Photian and superseded by Antonios. Bees (pp. 7–8) chooses the former, Sgouritsas (pp. 569–570) the latter alternative. The Life states that Theokletos was “driven from his flock”;⁵¹ and although it blames this action on the hostility of rich and worldly laymen, it also makes clear, in a passage which precedes an unfortunate lacuna,⁵² that Theokletos was at odds with a part of the clergy besides. His enemies afterwards repented and reinstated him.⁵³ This story, vague as it is, cannot be pressed in detail; but it may well preserve a local memory that Theokletos was expelled by the Photians after 877, and was later restored, either by Photius himself, or even after Photius’ own deposition in 886. This would account for the omission from our list of the interloping Bishop Antonios.

No. 6, Basil, is known to us as the author of a eulogy of St. Nicholas of Myra, and of a eulogy of Constantine the Great. Binon, who made this discovery,⁵⁴ examined the accounts of three posthumous miracles of St. Nicholas which are said to have taken place during the author’s lifetime.⁵⁵ References in them to Saracens in Crete (i. e. after *ca.* 826) and to the caliph’s residence at Samarra (i.e. between 836 and 892) led Binon to conclude that Basil, bishop of Lacedaemonia, lived and wrote at the end of the ninth century or the beginning of the tenth. This conclusion is fully confirmed by our list, if, as we have no reason to doubt, Basil was the immediate successor of Theokletos or of the intervening Antonios. It is worth noting, in view of Basil’s interest in St. Nicholas of Myra, that in the

eleventh century there was a monastery of that Saint west of the city of Lacedaemonia.⁵⁶

Nos. 7 and 8, Nicholas and Eustathios, who must have lived during the first half of the tenth century, are otherwise unknown to us. In connection with no. 9, Leon, we note a lead seal which may or may not be relevant. It was published by Schlumberger⁵⁷ after Mordtmann, and dated by him to the “*époque antérieure à 1050.*” It bears the inscription ΛΕΟΝΤΙΩ ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΩ ΠΟΛΕΩΣ ΛΑΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΑΣ. In view of the similarity of the names Leon and Leontios, and of the confusion we shall note lower down between the names Theodoros and Theodosios, it may well be that our no. 9 should be written Leontios. If not, the owner of the seal is another absentee from the catalogue.⁵⁸

No. 10, John, is again unknown. But no. 11, Theopemptos, is well attested both by literary and by archaeological evidence. He was bishop of Lacedaemonia at the time of the arrival there of St. Nikon Metanoeite, and still bishop at the time of the Saint’s death.⁵⁹ It is generally agreed that the Saint came to Lacedaemonia about the year 970.⁶⁰ It is probable that he died about the end of the tenth century, although the date of 998 given by Galanopoulos (129, 181–2) rests on a misinterpreted passage (Lambros, 205/4–9; Galanopoulos, 181), about which we shall have more to say. The last historically datable event in the Saint’s career is his week’s visit to the newly appointed military governor of Peloponnesus, Basil Apokaukos, at Corinth.⁶¹ The Bulgars were menacing Hellas and Peloponnesus. The Saint reassured the trembling governor, and foretold disaster to the Bulgars (τὴν ἐκείνων καταστροφήν). The

⁵⁶ Ὁ βίος Νίκωνος τοῦ Μετανοεῖτε, ed. Lambros, Νέος Ἑλληνομνημῶν, III (1906), 202/21–26: κατὰ τὸν ἐπίκειον (ἐπήκειον K) τόπον: the original word was probably αἰπεινόν.

⁵⁷ *Sigillographie*, 184.

⁵⁸ The seal of Leon Chamaretos, proedros of Lacedaemonia, is of course not that of a bishop: cf. Bees, *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, XXI (1914), pp. 196–197.

⁵⁹ Βίος Νίκωνος τοῦ Μετανοεῖτε, ed. Lambros, 164/19–22, 170/31, 171/11–17, 173/9–11, 183/26–28; ed. M. E. Galanopoulos (Athens, 1933), 99, 110, 111, 114, 183.

⁶⁰ Galanopoulos, 110.

⁶¹ Lambros, 174/17–175/16; Galanopoulos, 116–117.

⁵⁰ Mansi, XVII, 376 D.

⁵¹ Bees, 38/12: ἐξήλασαν τῆς ποιμνῆς τὸν ἄγιον.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 35/2–6.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 38/19–29.

⁵⁴ *Atti del V° Congresso internazionale di studi bizantini*, I (Rome, 1939), pp. 48–49.

⁵⁵ G. Anrich, *Hagios Nikolaos*, I (Teubner, 1913), pp. 169–181.

disaster in question was no doubt their defeat by Nicephorus Ouranos, which took place in 997.⁶² The Saint's visit to Corinth, therefore, took place very shortly before it. He then returned to Lacedaemonia, and found the aristocrat and scholar John Malakenos under arrest for treason,⁶³ an incident easily related to the widespread discontent provoked among the provincial landowners by Basil II's draconian edict of 996. Malakenos was taken to Constantinople, and acquitted. "Some little time afterwards" (ἱκανὸς γοῦν ὁ μετὰ χρόνος), while Malakenos was still in the capital, the Saint died: that is, round about the end of the century, when, as has been said, Theopemptos was still bishop of Lacedaemonia. His tenure of the see will, therefore, have occupied all or most of the last thirty years of the tenth century.⁶⁴

No. 12 is Theodosios. There would appear to be confusion in our list between the names Theodoros and Theodosios, which may have arisen through their being written in abbreviated form. The name of no. 15 is given as Theodoros, but he is, from his position, almost certainly identical with the Theodosios who is stated by the Chronicle of Monemvasia to have been bishop in 1082–1083, when Lacedaemonia was raised to the rank of metropolis.⁶⁵ But that there was in fact a Bishop Theodoros of Lacedaemonia is attested by three lead seals, dated tenth to eleventh centuries,⁶⁶ and by a clear reference to him in the Life of St. Theokletos as the patron of the author of that Life.⁶⁷ Whether, therefore, we are to identify this Bishop with our no. 12 or our no. 15, depends on the date at which the Life was written; and unfortunately we have little or no evidence for determining this with accuracy.

⁶² Cedrenus, Bonn. ed., II, 449/19–450/25; G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State* (Oxford, 1956), p. 273.

⁶³ Lambros, 177/15–178/32; Galanopoulos 121–123. Cf. Cedrenus, II, 451/19–22.

⁶⁴ For his lead seal, see Bees, Βυζαντίς, I (1909), p. 85, note 2; and another copy of the same, Dumbarton Oaks Collection, no. 3771.

⁶⁵ Bees, *ibid.*, p. 84: ἐπισκοποῦντος κυροῦ Θεοδοσίου ἐν ἔτει ,σφςα'.

⁶⁶ Schlumberger, *Revue des études grecques*, II (1889), p. 249; Bees, *Vizantijskoe Obozrenie*, II (1916), Supplement 1, 13–14; Dumbarton Oaks Collection, no. 3762.

⁶⁷ Bees, *ibid.*, 28/19–23.

Bees⁶⁸ maintained that the Life of St. Theokletos must have been written before A. D. 1000, since in its first line it states: οὐδὲ τὸν καθ' ἡμᾶς βίον οὐδὲ τὰς ἐπὶ τέλει τῶν αἰώνων γενεὰς ἀφῆκεν ἀβροθήτους εἰς ἀρετὴν ὁ πάντων φιλανθρώπως ἐπ' ἀγαθοῖς προμηθεύμενος κύριος, κτλ.: that is to say, God has not abandoned either the author's own lifetime or "the generations at the consummation of the aeons (eras)." This last phrase Bees interpreted as a reference to the belief of the Chiliasts that the year A. D. 1000 would inaugurate the millennium of Christ's rule on earth, and concluded that the author must have been writing before that date. Since, therefore, it is known that Theopemptos was bishop at least as late as ca. 997 and perhaps later, Bees would date the Life of St. Theokletos and the contemporary Bishop Theodoros *before* Theopemptos and near the middle of the tenth century. If he were right, then this Theodoros would be missing from our list.

But the argument is unsatisfactory. In the first place, there is little evidence to show that the expectation of Christ's Second Coming at A.D. 1000 was current in the Byzantine Empire, which had not adopted the Dionysian era. In the next place, even if rumors of a Second Coming had percolated from the West, the millenary of the Crucifixion (1033) was there regarded as an equally likely date for the event. But the belief of the Byzantines themselves was that the world would come to an end at the close of the seventh millennium from the Creation.⁶⁹ They were aware that they were living in the final αἰὼν of our dispensation, as a sentence written at nearly this time makes clear: in the treatise on the Origins of Constantinople, contemporary with Basil II (976–1025), we read ὁ περιὼν δὲ ὁ ἕβδομος οὗτος αἰὼν,⁷⁰ "the current aeon is this seventh (and last) one." This doubtless is the belief to which the writer of the Life of St. Theokletos refers; and his work, therefore, may well have been written after A.D. 1000.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 14–16.

⁶⁹ Cf. L. Allatii, *De libris et rebus ecclesiasticis Graecorum* & c., (Paris, 1646), p. 142: λέγεται δὲ ὅτι μετὰ τὴν τῶν ἑπτὰ χιλιάδων χρόνων παρέλευσιν ἔσται. On the whole subject, see Vasiliev, *Byzantion*, XVI (1942–1943), pp. 470–1, 487–9.

⁷⁰ Th. Preger, *Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum*, II (Teubner, 1907), p. 90.

This, it is true, does not help us to decide between no. 12, Theodosios and no. 15, Theodoros/Theodosios, as the author's patron. Some words of the author, which accuse Bishop Theodore's predecessors of neglecting the Lives of former Lacedaemonian worthies,⁷¹ would, however, certainly be more appropriate to the early than to the late eleventh century.

No. 13, Luke. Between Theopemptos, who cannot have lived far, if at all, into the eleventh century, and no. 15, Theodoros/Theodosios, who was probably bishop in 1082, we have only the three names, Theodosios (or Theodoros), Luke, and John. We might therefore assume, a priori, a lacuna in our list for this period. There is some reason to believe this assumption to be justified. An inscription found by Adamantiou in the Church of the Saviour built by St. Nikon Metanoëite at Sparta, after being variously published and interpreted,⁷² was at last properly reproduced and read by Soteriou.⁷³ It consists of the right-hand portion of two lines of a funerary inscription, which Soteriou read as:

... μαίου καὶ Λουκά τῶν μακαρίων ἐπισκόπων[ν]
... π[έμπτου]ν ἡμέ[ραν] ἐν ἐτ[εῖ] τῷ 596^α ἦν τελευτή
(sic)⁷⁴ Λουκάς ὁ ὄσι[ος]

The original may probably have run somewhat as follows: [After living in the days of Bartholomew and Luke, the late bishops, [Month of . . . , day . . .] Thursday in the year 6541 was finish Luke the Holy.

The year 6541, or A.D. 1033, is the year when this local Saint was "finish," and not, as Zakythenos states,⁷⁵ the date of the inscription itself. If this interpretation is correct, it is good evidence for a Luke, bishop of Lacedaemonia, in the year 1033, and for his predecessor Bartholomaios, or Eirenaios, or something of the sort, earlier in the eleventh century.

⁷¹ Ed. Bees, 28/26–28.

⁷² Galanopoulos, *op. cit.*, 110 and fig. 39; Koukoulès, 'Ἐπετηρίς Ἑταιρίας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν, XI (1935), p. 466; Galanopoulos, *ibid.*, XII (1936), p. 414.

⁷³ Πρακτικά τῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρίας (1939), pp. 114–115, fig. 10.

⁷⁴ The grammar is scarcely helped by supposing ἡν τελευτή to stand for ἐνετελεύτησε.

⁷⁵ *Le despotat grec de Morée*, II (Athens, 1953), p. 299.

It is possible that this Bishop Luke may be the Luke referred to in the Life of St. Nikon Metanoëite as τῇ τε μοναχικῇ πολιτείᾳ καὶ τῷ ἱερατικῷ διαλάμπων ἀξιώματι:⁷⁶ and this possibility would be strengthened if we could accept the version of the Koutloumousi MS, which describes him also as καθηγητοῦ καὶ ποιμένος.⁷⁷ But, as the Barberini MS⁷⁸ makes clear, it was not Luke who was originally so designated, but the abbot of the monastery of St. Nicholas, in which Luke was then a novice: τῷ τῶν εἰσαγωγικῶν τάγματι κατελεγμένος ὑπὸ καθηγητῆ καὶ ποιμένι, ἀνδρὶ θεῷ καὶ τροφίμῳ τῆς ἀρετῆς. Λουκάς δὲ ἦν ὄνομα τῷ νεανίᾳ, κτλ. However it may be, it is worth noting that the fact that this Luke is described as an elderly contemporary of the author of the Life of St. Nikon⁷⁹ is not necessarily an obstacle to his identification with Bishop Luke of *ca.* 1033. The Life has, ever since the time of Baronius,⁸⁰ been dated to the middle twelfth century, on the strength of a corrupt date furnished by the Barberini version (p. 673). In this version the author of the Life states that he became abbot of the monastery of St. Nikon in the eleventh indiction, the year 6650 (i.e. A.D. 1142). These data are inconsistent and therefore one of them is wrong. The Koutloumousi version, on the other hand, preserves the eleventh indiction, but gives the year as 6500 (A.D. 992), which is not only inconsistent with the indiction but also manifestly impossible. However, a comparison of the two versions makes it probable that the year originally given was 6550, or A.D. 1042, which corresponds with the eleventh indiction (September 1–December 31, 1042) according to the "proto-byzantine" reckoning described by Grumel.⁸¹ The Life of St. Nikon, on this supposition, was composed *ca.* 1050, and certainly before 1057, which is near enough to 1033 for a bishop of the latter year to be still alive, though grey-haired, some seventeen years later. This dubious identification does not justify a fuller examination here of the

⁷⁶ Lambros, 208/14–15; Galanopoulos, 186.

⁷⁷ Lambros, 208/12.

⁷⁸ MS Barberini gr. 583, p. 668.

⁷⁹ Lambros, 208/13.

⁸⁰ *Annales Ecclesiastici*, X, anno 961.

⁸¹ *La chronologie* (Paris, 1958), pp. 124–128; cf. *Echos d'Orient*, XXXIV (1935), pp. 319–326.

chronology of the Life, which, however, deserves to be re-examined in the light of this interesting possibility.

No. 15 is that Theodoros of whom we have spoken in reference to no. 12. If Luke was bishop during the middle years of the eleventh century, and after him came John (no. 14), of whom we know nothing, this Theodoros will have been bishop about the time when Lacedaemonia was raised to the status of a metropolis, that is in 1082–1083.⁸² As we are told by the Chronicle of Monemvasia that the bishop at that time was Theodosios, it is nearly certain that this Theodosios and our Theodoros are one and the same person; though it must remain uncertain which form of the name is the correct one.

Of nos. 16–20, Michael, Soterichos, Basil, John, and John the Monk, whose joint tenure must have covered the first half of the twelfth century, we can give no account. The next bishop who is firmly attested is no. 21, Niketas, whose signature is found on documents of 1166 and 1167;⁸³ and his successor John (no. 22) is similarly attested for July of the year 1173.⁸⁴

Nos. 23, 24, Niketas and Therapon, are again unknown, but probably datable to the last twenty years of the century. No. 25, John-Joseph, has already been discussed (*supra* p. 237). As he is last in the continuous list, and as this list, if contemporary with the other continuous lists, must have been compiled before 1273 at the latest, no. 25 was dead by then, and cannot be identical with the John of the Blachernae Synod (1285). It is to be noted that no. 25 became a monk, and died renamed Joseph: this would be consistent with his having been the last Orthodox bishop before the Latin conquest, after which, and his consequent expulsion, he might have embraced the monastic life. But, as has been said, this is far from certain. With his name the continuous list comes to an end.

When the first Orthodox bishop of Lacedaemonia was appointed after the

⁸² Dölger, *Regesten*, II, no: 1086; Grumel, *Les registes*, no: 928; Bees, *Βυζαντίς*, I (1909), pp. 84–85.

⁸³ Grumel, *Les registes*, nos. 1059, 1075; Migne, PG, CXL, cols. 260C, 281B.

⁸⁴ Grumel, *ibid.*, no. 1126; Ὁρθοδοξία, V (1930), p. 543; cf. *Echos d'Orient*, XXXIII (1934), p. 215, note 2.

Byzantine recovery of the Morea, we do not know, nor who he was. The first who is known to us does not occur in our list. He was Theodosios, metropolitan and hypertimos, who signed a document at Constantinople in November 1272.⁸⁵ Why he should be omitted can only be conjectured; but it may well be due to the same reason as that conjectured by Laurent for the omission of his contemporary Gregory from the list of Monemvasia, namely that he was λατινόφων. It is true that he did not sign the notorious document addressed to Pope Gregory X in 1274; but neither did Gregory of Monemvasia.⁸⁶

He was succeeded by the John of the Blachernae Synod, who has been noted above.

The separate commemorations begin with no. 26, Nicephorus, who donated the codex to the church of St. Demetrios (*supra*, p. 225). Nicephorus Moschopoulos is the best known and most fully documented of all the bishops of Lacedaemonia.⁸⁷ Manousakas has worked out the chronological data concerning him. He was appointed metropolitan of Crete, probably in 1283 and in any case not later than the summer of 1285, when he signed the Blachernae Synod. Owing to the Venetian occupation of Crete, he was unable to proceed thither; and instead, some time between the summer of 1285 and August 1289, was presented, κατ' ἐπίδοσιν, with the administration of the see of Lacedaemonia as "proedros."⁸⁸ He held this latter appointment for more than a quarter of a century, and built at Mistra the cathedral church of St. Demetrios. The founder's inscription survives, and has been dated by Manousakas⁸⁹ to 1291–1292. He was deprived of the Lacedaemonian see between September 1315 and April 1316. He is last heard of in 1322. The date of his death is unknown, but must have been before 1332

⁸⁵ Miklosich-Müller, IV, p. 379; Zakythenos, *Despotat grec*, II, p. 281; for "hypertimos," see Grumel, *Mémorial L. Petit*, 166.

⁸⁶ *Echos d'Orient*, XXXII (1933), pp. 146–147.

⁸⁷ See Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *BZ*, XII (1903), 215–223; Manousakas, Ἑλληνικά, XV (1957), pp. 232–246 (full bibliography); Zakythenos, *Despotat grec*, II, pp. 281, 284–5; Laurent, *Echos d'Orient*, XXVI (1927), p. 145, note 12; *id.*, *ibid.*, XXXII (1933), p. 404.

⁸⁸ Cf. Salaville, *Echos d'Orient*, XXIX (1930), pp. 432–434.

⁸⁹ Δελτίον τῆς Χριστιανικῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρίας, series 4, I (1959), pp. 72–79.

(*supra* p. 235). He was a keen collector and copier of books, and also a generous donor of them. His manuscripts are often embellished with epigrams of his own composition: while three of his prose dedications, printed by Papadopoulos-Kerameus,⁹⁰ are verbally similar to that written on the front of our MS.

After his departure the see of Lacedaemonia was again for a time granted, κατ' ἐπίδοσιν, to another metropolitan, this time of Patras.⁹¹ This bishop is found in possession by April 1316,⁹² but the length of his tenure is uncertain, except that it cannot have exceeded eight years.

The last Lacedaemonian bishop to be commemorated in our document is Gregorios, whose memory is eternized both here and higher up, at fol. 131^v. His surname is given by the Chronicle of Monemvasia⁹³ as Βουτᾶς, Voutás; and by this name he is referred to also in an inscription of his successor, Luke of Sougdaia, at Mistra.⁹⁴ He attended a synod at Constantinople in May 1324,⁹⁵ but by 1330, which is the date of the said inscription at

Mistra, he was already ὁ πρόην χρηματίσας Λακεδαιμονίας Βουτᾶς ἐκεῖνος. It was, as we saw, most probably he who added the valuable record of fol. 168 to the Synodicon of his predecessor Nicephorus. The date of his death is unknown.⁹⁶

We have lastly to deal with the person commemorated in the lower margin of fol. 168^v. He is Anthimos, metropolitan of Crete and νέος ὁμολογητής. He is commemorated, in a later hand, also in the Synodicon of Syvrita.⁹⁷ Laurent has recovered with great skill what can be known of him.⁹⁸ He and his predecessor Makarios were the only two Orthodox metropolitans of Crete to function in the island under the Venetian occupation. Makarios, in the middle of the fourteenth century, seems to have been unmolested by the Venetians. Anthimos, bishop of Athens, was translated to Crete during a Greek revolt, very plausibly identified by Laurent with the revolt of 1365–1367. He was imprisoned when the revolt was crushed, and died about 1370. The fame of his constancy obviously spread beyond the confines of Crete, if he could be so commemorated in a Synodicon of the Morea.

⁹⁰ *Op. cit.* pp. 220–222.

⁹¹ Miklosich-Müller, I, pp. 19–20.

⁹² *Ibid.*, pp. 52–53.

⁹³ Bees, Βυζαντίς, I (1909), p. 69.

⁹⁴ Millet, *BCH*, XXIII (1899), p. 123; Zakythenos, *Despotat grec*, II, p. 285.

⁹⁵ Miklosich-Müller, I, p. 103.

⁹⁶ For what is known of his successors in the see of Lacedaemonia, see Zakythenos, *Despotat grec*, II, pp. 285–286.

⁹⁷ *Echos d'Orient*, XXXII (1933), p. 389.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 404–411.

οἷς
 +6 αρ. αὐτὴν ἐκείνην δυνάω καὶ τὸ πᾶν οἶσ' καὶ
 διὰ αὐτὴν χάρις αὐτῶν ἀναθεμένη.

Ἰ οἷς φρονοῖσι καὶ λήροισι τὸ λαλῶνται ἀπὸ τοῦ
 ἐν' ἐπὶ τῆς θ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ μορφῶς φῶς
 ποτὲ μὲν ἦν αἰν δαλμα καὶ κτισμα καὶ φα
 σμα, ἐπὶ βραχὺ φανέν καὶ διὰ νῦν παρ α
 χρῆμα, ποτὲ δὲ αὐτῶν τῶν οἶσ' αὐτῶν, ὡς
 εἶς αὐτὰ τὰ ἐν αὐτῶν τῶν φρεσὶς λαβῶς καὶ
 ἀδῶ αὐτῶν ποσὶν τε λῶς ἐ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ ῥιπτοισι,
 καὶ τὸν τομῆν, τῶν ἀρῶν καὶ μελῶσις μαρῶν,
 εἰς κτισμὰ καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν μῶν, ὅτι τὸ καὶ τὸν
 ἐν αὐτῶν κατατέμνοντες, τοῦτο δὲ, τῶν πᾶν μαρῶν
 λισμῶν δυνάστωσιν σφῆρα μελῶσις, τῶν θ' αὐ
 οἶσ' ἀφ' ὁρᾶν ἐν αὐτῶν λῶν πᾶν, ἐκ μολογοῖσι
 δὲ, καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ τῶν ἡ' αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν σφῆρα
 ῥῶς καὶ τὸ τῶν ἐκ λῶστωσιν ὅστε βῆσ' φρονῶν μα
 μῶν τε κτισμὰ ἐν αὐτῶν τῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκ λῶστωσιν
 μῶν τε οἶσ' αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ τι σφῆρα καὶ φῶς κῶν χρεῖν
 καὶ ἐκ λῶστωσιν καὶ ἐκ λῶστωσιν, ὅτι αὐτῶν τῶν
 δ' αὐτοῖσιν, ἀχρηστωσιν αὐτῶν οἶσ' αὐτῶν,
 ἐκ λῶστωσιν.

Ἰ τι τοῖς αὐτῶν σφρονοῖσι καὶ λῶστωσιν, καὶ λῶστωσιν,
 ἐκ λῶστωσιν καὶ λῶστωσιν ἐκ λῶστωσιν, ἀλλὰ μολο
 γῶσιν οἶσ' αὐτῶν, ταυτοῖσιν καὶ αὐτῶν ἀφ' ὁρᾶν
 ποσὶν τε λῶστωσιν οἶσ' αὐτῶν, τῶν τῶν θ' αὐτῶν καὶ
 τῶν θ' αὐτῶν ἐκ λῶστωσιν, καὶ ἐκ λῶστωσιν καὶ ἐκ λῶστωσιν.

ἔθρον τῆς τοῦ κλαυπνοσυνόρου μενῶ.
 ἐν δὲ τῇ κρήνῃ τομὸν τῆς μουσῆ
 ῥαταῖς ἐξ οὗ οὐξ ἐμεσῶν τι καὶ ἡλῆ
 μύον ἐαυτὸν ὡς καλέσων τι. ὅταν
 προπῆφῃ τῆς σωτηρίας τοῦ κομ
 μίας τοῦ χυ. σὺν τοῖς διεσφαιμῶ
 αὐτοῦ δ' ὕμνοι καὶ σφαιμῶσι. καὶ
 τοῖς ὁμοφροσιν αὐτῶν αἰνέσμεν.
 τοῖς ὁμοσφροσιν ἡμετέροις ἐν τῇ
 καὶ δ' ὡς ἡμετέροις ὡς ἐκ τοῦ κο
 μίας. τοῦ σφῶ ἡμετέροις ἐν τῇ
 καὶ ἐν τῇ. οἷα τρῶα αὐτοῖς ὅ
 ῥως τῶ αὐτῶν σφαιμῶσι ἡμετέροις. ὅ
 τῇ μετὰ τῆς φθῆς σφαιμῶσι. καὶ τῇ
 ῥογόν δ' ὡς. καὶ ὅς ἐστιν ἐκ τοῦ
 φύσιν καὶ ἡμετέροις τῆς ὡς
 καὶ μετὰ τῶν σφαιμῶν τοῦ
 καὶ αὐτοῦ ὡς μετὰ τῶν σφαιμῶν. ὅ
 τοῖς ἐστὶν ἡμετέροις σφαιμῶσι. τῶν
 τῶν μετὰ τῶν σφαιμῶν δ' ὡς μετὰ
 ὅς ἐστὶν καὶ μετὰ τῶν σφαιμῶν. ὅ
 ὅς ἐστιν ἡμετέροις σφαιμῶσι. τῶν
 ὅς ἐστιν ἡμετέροις σφαιμῶσι. τῶν

